Dear People,

We here have recently received a copy of an interview with Linda Evans, one of the people charged in the US Resistance Conspiracy Case. The interview is rather new, and at the moment we've been asked ~~xx~~ to help in achiving publicity and support for these people being ~~xxxx~~ charged, and to help shed light on the represive Amerikan judicial policies. Any help you could give these people would be appreciated. We want this information to get to as many people as possible, so if you know anybody who might want to publish it give it to them. There isn't a copyright on it either, so there shouldn't be any problems there.

Thanks for your help,
Ecomedia Hamburg

Write to Linda Evans
no. 233-411
1901 "d" St. SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
USA

Q: Could you first describe the state security forces' investigation against you and then sort of give the reasons why the state goes on with the Resistance Conspiracy trial, charging you with the bombing of the Capitol in 1984 ?

: We believe that the investigation of the seven of us who are indicted in this case really grew out of the FBI's investigation of the armed clandestine resistance within the black liberation struggle and the Puerto Rican independence movement and their links with revolutionary anti-imperialists here in the US. This investigation intensified as political bombings which occured from 1982 to 1985 were claimed by a variety of armed clandestine organizations: the United Freedom Front , and organizations accused of the armed actions in this case - the Revolutionary Fighting Group, the Armed REsistance Unit and the REd Guerrilla Reistance. We are tracing the beginning of this investigation back to an international law enforcement conference about " The War against International Terrorism" that took place in Puerto Rico in 1978. The FRG was part of it, Israel and Uruguay were participating and the US was the initiator. At that point we mark in our analysis the initiation or the consolidation of a modern counterinsurgency strategy against US revolutionary groups.

Q: Could you describe some of the tactics within this strategy ?

: I think there are several aspects. One of them is the military aspect, one is the psychological aspect - both against revolutionaries themselves and against the populations. And there of course are political aspects in terms of propaganda. I will give examples of allof those, how they are being used in the US context domestically later. But the conference meant that the war against revolutionaries inside the US - both from the national liberation movements inside the US and the white allies - was brought into the international " war against terrorism". So it had a domestic component at that point and it was part of the overall strategy in the Reagan era of building up the international "war against terrorists" as a way to destroy revolutionary movements.
One of the developments of this conference was the formation of the Joint Terrorist Task Force (JTTF) of the FBI in 1980. The JTTF was actually fromed immediately after William Morales, a Puerto Rican independence fighter, escaped from prison hospital, and after Assata Shakur, a leader of the Black Liberation Army (BLA) escaped from a maximum security prison in 1979. Some other comrades of the Resistance Conspiracy Case have been accused of assisting in both of these prison escapes. The JTTF actually represented a major development in police surveillance and counter insurgency in so far as it is the unification of police forces from every level under the leadership of the FBI. That means that they have many more resources, they have more money to work with, they have an incredibly sophisticate computer system which is national in its scope and they certainly have more people and many more experts in terms of numbers of agents to work with. So it is the JTTF that

actually pursued the investigation of the 7 of us and is in charge of the investigation of the Puerto Rican independence movement and the Black revolutionary movement. We realized that in 1981 there was a major breakthrough for the JTTF in terms of their ability to follow up on an incredible number of leads that they got from a failed expropriation of an armored truck in Upstate New York, known as the Brinks expropriation. Several black revolutionaries were arrested at that time, several white anti-imperialists were arrested with them. In the process of the JTTF's investigation one New Afrikan comrade - MtAyari ShAbaka Sundiata - was murdered in cold blood by the police after a shoot-out. His companion Sekou Odinga was tortured and it took three months of hospitalization before he could even function in a normal manner. Another man was tortured until he turned state evidence . There was a major Grand Jury investigation in which people were subpoenaed and an attempt to force them to testify they were imprisoned. MAny of them resisted - Alan BErkman, who is one of the defendants in this case - was one of the people subpoenaed on that case who resisted and rather went to prison than testified.

Q: Could you describe some of the methods in relation to the JTTF's investigation of you ?

L: : In the process of following up the leads from the various arrests in 1981 and in 1984 of several Puerto Rican revolutionaries, the JTTF both got leads in terms of identification, methodology, and they were able to intimidate and force some people - very few, but enough comrades - to turn traitor and testify and give them information about the inner workings of the clandestine organizations as well as the identities of many activists in the various movements. That then gave them information about how people operated underground. For example the JTTF targetted the comrades accused of bombings claimed by the UNited Freedom Front, who had children with them in clandestinity, by going to childcare centers and schools and disseminating wanted posters of the children. Against the 7 of us, the JTTF did the same thing with health food stores, because they knew that some of the revolutionaries ate healthy food. They attempted to get a wide network of people in a self-concious way to cooperate with the FBI. One of the things they did was they used blockades on highways as a means of checking for revolutionaries, doing spot checks of cars, passing out wanted posters to people in the cars and checking if there were any of the people on wanted posters in that car. The JTTF also published sensationalistic articles about us in Readers' Digest, complete with wanted poster photos. This magazine is distributed to nearly every dentist's and doctor's waiting room in the entire US, as well as being in every library, newsstand, and sold in every grocery store. There was a lot of illegal surveillance and searches of houses and public telephones which was done absolutely without warrants. The US has a systematic way whereby both telephone, room or house surveillance and searches are ~~is~~ done . Although ~~that was not done by~~ There was no warrant obtained by the FBI, ~~it has been upheld~~ all the illegal surveillance will be used in all of the subsequent trials. They did a lot of break-ins into homes and political offices of families and supporters and they of course used again Grand Jury subpoenas and threats of imprisonment.

Q: Could you go more into detail why the state is bringing these indictments against you and why the state pursues the Resistance Conspiracy Case, especially since you have been through 14 separate trials already and four of you have already received sentences between 45 and 70 years ?

: We have a total of 235 years against us and they want to give us 258 years more. It is an obvious question – why would the state pursue this indictment when they already have us in prison basically for the rest of our lives. This goes back to some of the political and psychological reasons and tactics within the counterinsurgency strategy. This case is basically the last political indictment that was brought by the Meese Justice Department before Meese was forced to leave in total scandal and disgrace. At the time of the indictment, people in the US were becoming more determined to resist US interventions in Central America. There had been numerous demonstrations after the US invasion of Grenada , along with the bombing of the Capitol that we are accused of. People were outraged by the blatant violations of both US law and international law that were being exposed in the Iran/Contra Scandal and opposition against US support for apartheid in South Africa was growing too, especially among students. In order to continue to implement its aggressive foreign policies, the US needs to repress, control and stop domestic political opposition to those politics. So the indictment against us is part of a strategy to control and intimidate the resistance movement, especially the most militant sectors. This case is designed to stop serious, militant activists from developing any capacity for clandestine resistance, and from developing any revolutionary strategy that includes armed struggle as a component. It is also an attempt to divert attention from the Iran Contra scandal and from the role the highest placed US officials were playing in it. I think there is a second aspect to it. They want to divide the progressive movement along the lines of violence versus nonviolence, legal protest versus illegal resistance. The US government wants to be able to define the boundaries of the resistance movement in every way possible so that they can control it. Therefore in the US there is a lot of reluctance to break laws in terms of building a protest movement, and the US has really manipulated that by saying that people who do illegal activities are terrorists. Therefore they have succeeded to some extent in building a wall between the msot militant sectors of the resistance movement and people who are engaging in resistance at a different level, perhaps not wanting to break the law, but willing to participate in demonstrations.

Q: Is there any equivalent to the § 129a in the FRG which is used against revolutionaries and the legal resistance ?

: Here there is nothing like that. What they have done – which makes it very difficult for us to bring our politics into our trials – is that they insist we should be tried in

the most narrow, criminal and technical way possible . There are a couple of ways that the have done that: One is that they have charged a lot of revolutionaries with "racketeering" and being part of racketeering influenced organizations which puts us on the same level as the Mafia. ~~Part of it is~~ The use of racketeering evokes the whole aura of drug trafficking and profiteering when in fact none of the revolutionaries charged under this statute are convicted ~~under it~~. of drugs or activities for personal profit. I think the other thing that they have done which is important in terms of criminalization is that they charged some people, especially the Puerto Rican independence fighters, under "seditious conspiracy" which means an overt attempt to overthrow the US government. They can do that particularly to the Puerto Ricans because the Puerto Ricans are fighting an anti-colonial battle for independence. They have also used it and are currently using it against some white anti-imperialists who are on trial in Massachussetts, known as the Ohio Three of the seven or currently on a trial that combines both racketeering charges and seditious conspiracy.

Q: In your current trial you are being tried with " conspiracy". Does that entail that the government actually has to prove that you did the bombing of the Capitol or that you just have to conspired to do so ?

L[illegible].: I think that is another reason why the government has brought the trial at this point. Legally, they want to continue to expand the use of the conspiracy laws. And the answer to your question is "no". They don't have to prove that any of us did the Capitol bombing or any of the other bombings that we are accused of. They have no direct evidence of that , and they admit this. They have no eye-witnesses, they can't place any of us at the scene of any of the bombings. What they have done is to try to use a lot of circumstancial evidence and political evidence to prove that we agreed with each other to implement the goal of the conspiracy which they say is to "influence, protest and change US policies and practices in various international and domestic matters through illegal and violent means". So, obviously the goals of the conspiracy as defined by the government, were to influence, protest and change - which under many conditions would be absolutely legal in the US. What they intend to do is a criminalization of our political associations and they want to prove that by knowing each other, by agreeing with each other politically, by having worked with each other in various organizations, we therfore are guilty of conspiracy, by agreeing to have a political goal. The way this will be applied to the specific bombings and to convict us of them is through a combination of using an aiding and abetting law which means that anything you do to support one of the bombings could be considered "aiding and abetting" - even passing on a communique, manufacturing some kind of ID, renting an apartment that was then used by revolutionaries. All of that could be considered aiding and abetting and you become as guilty of the bombings as if you had done the bombing itself.

Q: Does that criminalize the whole legal support work ?

. . .: Potentially, it could.

Q: Part of the support work that is being done around your case is actually also focused on the upcoming trial. It seems like the conditions the state is creating for the trial are very similar to the conditions of the trials in Stammheim.

. .: The militarization of the courtroom is unprecedented. They have built a bullet proof wall in the courtroom, they put in surveillance cameras for the first time in a federal court that are aimed at the defendants and at the spectators specifically for surveillance purposes by the FBI. This is part of their whole strategy of portraying us as "terrorists". The atmosphere in the courtroom, the propaganda in the media is aimed at isolating us and to intimidate people from supporting us. The militarization of the courtroom is part of that because people will be afraid to attend the trial, because it is scary to go into a courtrrom when you see the whole place is ringed with marshals.
There are helicopters over the courtroom, there are snipers on the roof of the courtroom , they all have bullet-proof vests. They will ahve a high-speed convoy with police sirens and many police cars that bring us to court every day through the streets of Washington DC, so that everybody can point and say " there go the terrorists". The whole atmosphere around the trial is designed to terrify the jury, so that they can assume that we are guilty before the trial even begins. Another aspect of what we are going to have to struggle very hard against is that in other political trials in the past, they have instituted anonymous juries. Normally in the US defense lawyers, the court and the prosecutor know who the jurors are which enables people to pick a jury. Then there is some chance of some sympathetic or open-minded juror. Trying to institute an anonymous jury is part of just terrorizing the jurors. They are isolated in hotels throughout the trial, under armed guard by the US marshals, and they are told it is for their own protection, because the people on trial are "dangerous".

I think the other reason that the state brought this indictment is because they are really trying to rehabilitate the FBI. It went through a period of being restricted after the illegal programs of the 60s and the COINTELPRO program of the early 70s were exposed. Now, and under Reagan in particular, the FBI is resurgent. It is getting more powerful and its scope is broader. They want to solve the Capitol bombing, and they want to be able to show themselves as succesful in their "anti-terrorist" strategy. This then will justify all the illegal activities that they have done.

Q: By these special conditions that are being created around this trial, do you feel it will be at all possible for you to defend yourselves as revolutionaries ? And is a political defense allowed under the conspiracy laws ?

.: As I said before, the laws that we are being tried under are criminal statutes. It means the judge automatically can restrict the amount of political information that we bring into the trial. The trial itself is going to be a battleground for ourselves to make it into a political trial and for the government to narrow it into the most narrow criminal trial. What we plan to do - and hope to do - has a couple of different political aspects. One is to portray ourselves as revolutionaries, to show what our history of work in the many parts of the progressive movements has been, to portray ourselves as supporters of the national liberation movements here in the US and around the world. And to show that we are part of a progressive movement in this country that is fighting for change - to stop racism and racist attacks, to support women´ s liberation and an end to lesbian and gay oppression, a movement that supports the basic human rights of all people to have housing, food, education, health care and jobs.
The second thing which we really hope to do is to expose the US government as an outlaw government under international law, and to show all the different ways - or as many as the jurors can comprehend - how the US violates international law, how it violates basic human rights every day of its own citizens. Because some of us have fought against the Ku-Klux-Klan as public activists, we hope we will be able to show how the US government encourages white supremacy and white supremacist organizations like the Nazis and the KKK here in the US to expose that to the jury. We hope to expose the illegal activities in the contra war against Nicaragua and in El Salvador that the government has perpetrated. Similarly its support for Zionism and its support for apartheid. So we plan - as best possible - to bring in experts on international law and explain to the jury our motivations as part of the resistance movement. This does not mean saying " yes, we did the bombings", but "yes, we are part of a resistance movement that has many different aspects to it, and it engages in amny tactics of resistance" ; that this movement is a legitimate movement, that it is justified because of US crimes around the world: So, these are two of the things we hope to accomplish with the trial, and of course the kind of outside support we are able to build is very important.

Q: It seems that around all the other trials there hasn´t been a very big media campaign. The information hasn´t been so much directed at the broader public , but at the progressive community. Do you think that this pattern will be broken with this trial ?

....: No, I don´t think so. Its showtrial character will be dominantly directed in the courtroom and at the anti-imperialists who support a revolutionary struggle . Part of the 1978 conference in Puerto Rico was an overt agreement between the press and the US government that they would not portray revolutionaries as human beings and that they would ignore the political context of our actions in the media. The media will cooperate with the FBI in portraying us only as criminals and terrorists, and that agreement has been pretty much fulfilled by the press.

There has been some alternative press coverage, some coverage in the lesbian and gay and women's press, but overall we really had to struggle to get our perspective on the trial out And I think that will continue to be really difficult.

Q: Before your arrests all of you have been long time activists in various public progressive movements. Could you describe that a little bit and probably describe why you decided to take up a more militant struggle against the system ?

.: I think all of us were formed in the crucible in the 1960s when the national liberation movements around the world were on the rise and were challenging the hegemony of US imperialism. For all of us that has been a very formative experience for a couple of reasons: We were all anti-racists and each of us had been impacted by the civil rights movement, has joined in activities in support of the black masses in the South who were demonstrating and risking their lives for the right to vote and to end segregation and to fight for human rights. We had all been impressed by the fact that such a simple thing as the democratic right to vote demanded that people risk their lives and come up both against the Ku-Klux-Klan and against the power of the state. In the 60s, when we began to see a black power movement talking about nationhood, talking about the right to self-determination that impressed us as a correct strategy for ending racism. At the same time when we saw the nation of Vietnam capable of winning against the US that also told us something about the potential for changing things, not just protesting and being dissatisfied , but changing things. All of us had some relationship to the black liberation struggle as a very formative part of our politics. The Black liberation struggle raised the issues of power and how change can be made. It also raised fundamental issues of the values of the society and the content of our lives - the things we fight for. Several of us were right in the beginnin of building some solidarity organizations with the Puerto Rican independence movement. All of those things formed our politics. They also brought us in direct confrontation with the forces of the state, particularly the FBI. And as a result we were also targetted by counter intelligence programs in the 60s. That played a big role in convincing us that you cannot build any kind of resistance movement - not just a revolutionary movement - that seriously challenges the ability of the US government to carry out its colonialist policies inside the borders of the US and around the world without having a clandestine component of it. That is one of the reasons why we were all committed to build an armed clandestine movement.

Q: At the time when you chose or were forced to go underground it seems like the first wave of organized armed struggle in the US had already been suppressed by COINTELPRO and by the Weather Underground basically dispersing. Where you relating a lot to their experiences and how did you relate to the mass movements, i.e., the Central America

solidarity movement, at the time when you were underground ?

:: That is a hard question. First of all, it is true that during the sixties when there was a massive anti-war movement the resistance movement was very broad and encompassed many forms of resistance. There were other armed groups as well, not just the Weather Underground. It is also true that the Weather Underground stopped engaging in armed struggle and withdrew from support for national liberation struggles in the mid-70s. However, the Black Liberation Army (BLA) continued to function right up into the 80s. The FALN (Fuerzas Armadas de Liberacion National) of the Puerto Rican independence movement continued to function. And one of the things that influenced us very much was that we were always engaged in revolutionary solidarity on many different levels. We are committed to resisting and stopping US war crimes, and that both makes us a part of the Central America movement and also differentiates us from many sectors of the movement. Within the movement there are people who want to try to intervene to stop US war crimes and other who only want to educate people about US politics. That sector of the Central America mcvement believs that you should not break the law or use militant forms of struggle Because the government´s policies towards Central America are continuing, the more militant sector has become more sympathetic to us and our commitment to resist. There is more support for us now than there was at the point when we were still underground. I think part of that is because we are in prison now, we are more accessible for people, they can struggle with us. We have more of a relationship to some of the mass movements now. Whenever you have a series of arrests as serious as ours and the otehr clandestine resistanc organizations in this country, you have to reevaluate. You have to evaluate both your strategy and your tactics. You can´t say it was all tactical errors. There have to be strategic errors . The six of us are not part of one revolutionary organization, and we are all rethinking many different things. But I think it is safe to say for all of us what we will never give up is our ability to resist.

Q: You have said earlier that all of you have been very much influenced by the women´s liberation movement. Whta exactly do you refer to by that ?

.1: For those of us in this case who are women, we all went through the experiences that women in this society have - being targetted by all kinds of violence, being denigrated being treated as second-class citizens, and more, and more being forced to internalize certain forms of our own oppression. Our response to that oppression was to identify with other oppressed people and to commit ourselves to fighting for our own liberation. For us the beginnings of the women´s liberation movement had held out not just the hope of our own equality and freedom and the right to fully participate in this society, but also the whole concept of liberation itself. That is such a revolutionary concept, which I think is why there can never be a sustained women´s liberation movement outside the context of a revolutionary movement. As a whole the concept of

that are part of what it will mean for women to win their liberation and for lesbians to win their liberation, is fundamental to changing the values this society is constructed on.

Q: I would like to come back to that. Linda and you both have been outspoken lesbians. Do you see any contradictions for yourselves in working with a mixed anti-imperialist group ?

: Linda and I, and Marilyn and Susan, have all been part of separate women's organizations, but never separatist. The difference is that the separatist women's movement and the separatist lesbians movement have a different analysis of who the enemy is - they define patriarchy and men as the enemy, as opposed to imperialism and male supremacy. I have been able to work with separatist groups, but only on a very limited basis, because I look at the national liberation struggles as my ally; they look at only women as their allies and men of any nations as their enemies. We believe very strongly in the need for women to have caucuses, groups, separate organizations. Being part of autonomous women's groups or women's caucuses or trying to create a separate women's program is not just a reflection that men are hard to work with, which they are very often, are but to me it is also part of devloping a revolutionary process which at the end will create a different society from what would exist if we didn't have that.

Q: In Europe , people have mostly seen what the Reagan administration has done on an international level, but maybe you can talk a little bit about what has changed domestically and how those changes effected any kind of domestic opposition to the system ?

: The policies of the Regan adminsitration both internationally and domestically were characterized by increased domination and exploitation, by an unprecedented build-up of the military capabilities and military industries. All in an attempt to reinstitute the US as the hegemonic imperialist power. The attack on the first black socialist nation in this hemisphere - Grenada - showed what the Reagan administration's position on self-determination was. The Reagan era has had a desvastating impact on probably all but the ruling class. It has been felt in every class and it is being particularly felt by the oppressed nations' communities. The level of cultural genocide was raised. The so-called "war on drugs", the drug war, has really been a war against black people and Latin American people, Puerto Rican and Mexican people. And they have been very succesful in turning everything around - it is what George Orwell called " new speak" - to make things be the opposite of what they really are. The state has created conditions that leaves people homeless, where there are no social programs or medical care. Even the small level of reforms that people gained in the late 60s and 70s has been cut and wiped out and basically the state said " every one for themself". This

has taken place at the major expense of black people and working class white people and women. I think that the Reagan era has been very devastating domestically, but to a large degree that is based on a level of consolidation of what they call "winning the hearts and minds". This is what they have learned from Vietnam - they have been succesful to divide the struggle, to divide the people. The state has shaped the questions to try to create an internal enemy. So now, anti-imperialists like ourselves become part of the internal enemy. Black people ~~become~~ are made part of the internal enemy, ~~because they use drugs, they are poor and oppressed and so they steal~~. The government is creating enemies in order to divert attention from the racism and the concept of white supremacy and to cover up the real question of who is the enemy and what is the enemy, to allow them to increase repression - such as the "war against terrorism."

Q: All of you are talking about the US as an empire and colonial nation, both domestically and internationally. Could you specify that , and also could you specify what effects that has on the struggle in the US ?

S: The main thing about the US being an empire is that , because there are internal colonies that are held by one government within the same land base, there is no homogenous struggle - there is no one working class, there is no one movement, and so the anti-imperialist sector of the movement has been defined, grown up, and matured a.. in relationship to the advances of national liberation movements inside of the internally held colonies. I think that is the most critical difference between us and our European counterparts, in addition to us being in the center of what has been until recently the center of the imperialist system. So it has got the most intense elements of the contradictions. It is also for us been analytically the tool for the destruction of this country. Because there are internal colonies, because there are oppressed people and because it is an empire that has grafted together different peoples into one federal state, the key to its change, massive change - whatever form that may take - is primarily been from the Third World people in this country. As the national struggles achieve self-determination , the empire will be broken up. The eight years of the Reagan regime have entrenched a facis ideology in this country and an economic system that is at the base of that. But it is the struggle of the internal colonies that is the most dynamic, both because of their national character and because it is members of the internal colonies who also are in the most militant part of the working class. Because the genocide against the oppressed and poor people has taken such a strong advance, there is a reaction and there is going to be more of a reaction. For example in the black communities there is a beginning of an understanding again of the police, and the role of the police, as an occupying force by the US to maintain domination and control in that community, i.e. in New York where there has been a lot of opposition by different black people and African Americans. Now the opposition is not in a very organized state of development, but it is definitely emerging again.

I think the 90s are going to be about that kind of mass struggle around social conditions and with some kind of political consciousness that comes from the fact that it is based on racism and national oppression. There has been a series of murders of black people by white people in every major urban center in the last period. And there has been a response by the black community to that in New York. They called it the "day of outrage". There were several thousand people who occupied downtown Manhattan in protest of that. That is just one example of the kind of development. Now, that is not necessarily a new development, but it is part of a political process whereby new strategies and opinions can begin to emerge. I certainly believe that if there is going to be any kind of change - revolutionary or reformist - it is going to be located and motivated from the struggle of oppressed peoples.

There are other examples in terms of the Puerto Rican movement. I would say very briefly that Puerto Rico has been a direct colony of the US, and for us as anti-imperialists we believe that it is our absolute responsibility to struggle for the independence of Puerto Rico. That is a struggle that is going on right now, and it is going on with the Central America solidarity movement, to say that they have to include Puerto Rico, because the US government occupies 19% of the land in Puerto Rico through the military bases. It is US military and nuclear power that dominates the life of the island. The US at the moment is trying to force on the Puerto Rican people a false plebiscite, namely to cover their tracks in the ~~anti-intervention~~ international community. Because the Central American and Caribbean nations recognize Puerto Rico as part of the Caribbean and as part of the struggle that is going on in that region. And as long as those nations continue to agitate against the US's hold on Puerto Rico, the US feels some pressure on taht issue and they don't want to deal with that in the next period because Puerto Rico is also very profitable. It is also very important militarily. It is from the Roosevelt Naval Base in Puerto Rico that the US will launch any kind of military operation in any part of Central America. It is their only option in regard to loosing the Panama Canal. There is a lot of motion around Puerto Rico right now, and whether or not the liberation movement is going to be able to use it in the most positive way is unclear. But what is absolutely important for anybody looking at the US left is that the independence movement cannot be destroyed by the US.

Q: What are the conditions under which you are being held in the DC Jail. And how has been and is being isolation used against you ?

.: When we first got here at the DC Detention Center we were held at what they call here special handling which meant that we were locked in our cells 23 hours a day. We were never allowed to go out with other prisoners. We had all our conversations and correspondence monitored and whenever we left our cell block we were both in leg irons and handcuffs, including in legal meetings. This was done directly at the request of a special group within the US Marshall Service that handles security for pps. They spread rumors among the staff and tried to get to the prisoners that the six of us were involved in a white supremacist group rather than with a revolutionary group therby tring to isolate us further from the bulk of the population, the African-American people who are here. We tried to fight those conditions through a mass mobilization and in the courts. After about six months we were actually able to get the judge to order some changes in our conditions. For most of the past year we actually have been held in conditions not too dissimilar from the bulk of the population here. One thing that was part of the special handling and continued for a year was that we were never allowed outside. At the end of the year the judge decided that this was in fact becoming cruel and unusual punishment. We are now allowed to go outside for two hours a week which is just as much as the rest of the population gets here. I think the critical thing in terms of the DC Jail and our current conditions for people in Europe to understand is to what extent prisons in the US really are concentration camps and ware houses for particularily African-American people , but certainly for other Third World people as well. I also spend two years in a series of county jails and in jails in other large cities that also had a large percentage of black prisoners where the conditions are very similar to the conditions in DC Jail: basically tremendous overcrowding, no educational programs, essentially no legal facilities restrictive visiting; basically horrible, run-down conditions. And I think it is important for people to understand that in many ways it corresponds to the same kind of conditions you see in the school systems, in the social welfare systems, in any of the institutions in this society which primarily deal with poor people and especially poor Third World people. For many people, for many young people from the African American community that you see coming in here, caught up in the cycle of poverty and unemployment and too often drugs which go along with it, it is like going from one institution to the other - it is just part of this cycle, of life in the US.

Q: Almost all of you have been held in isolation which seems to be a part of the special counterinsurgency programme the state security forces are using against pps in the US , but also in the FRG for example .

: Without exceptions all of us in fact have spent long periods of time in isolation before we got here. And again it always gets done under the guise of security precautions. Like a lot of the things that happen with pps inside prisons, they take techniques that

A3

are also used against certain social prisoners, but against pps it is systematized , made more intense and there is no guise of it being disciplinary , it is totally administrative. Isolation is increasingly being used in the US prisons. But usually there are some justifications - there is the justification that the person was involved in some violent incident, that the person tried to escape. But with pps from the moment they are arrested the intention is to isolate us in many ways. The idea is to isolate us from the people on the outside which I think is the primary thing. We are held in places where we have restricted phone calls, totally monitored correspondence . And when you get to a place like the Lexington HSU (High Security Unit for Women) or Marion (Anm. HSU for men) , isolation is totally embodied in the institution itself. The institution is designed to try to disrupt any ties that you have on the outside, to try to completely isolate you and that serves two purposes: one, it throws the prisoner back on her or himself and on our own resources to try to maintain our own identity in a period of time when you can't see people from the movement, can't correspond with people from the movement in any significant way - they also censor the newspapers we have access to. They try to cut off every part of our political identity and force us back just onto our own resources. On the other hand I think that the pps often are people who have been some of the most committed militant fighters from their own movements and so also our own political input and the ability to have access to what is going on in the outside movements are clearly attempted to be cut off by isolation .

I do also want to comment on the fact that the US has the death penalty. I think it is inhumane and as applied in the US totally racist in nature, even as it is used in relationship to social prisoners and to date it has been mostly used for social prisoners. Although a number of years ago certain crimes against the state - as part of a resurgence of the whole FBI counterinsurgency apparatus - ~~here~~ is about to become ~~some~~ one of the few crimes where there is a federal death penalty in the US. For instance, a bombing of a federal building in which someone is killed carries a federal death penalty now. Usually murder is a state charge, not a federal charge, but they created certain federal crimes which are particularily designed in relationship to what they label "terrorist activities" to carry the death penalty.

There is a pp in the US - Mumia Abu-Jamal - who was given a death sentence and is currently facing the death penalty because of an intense confrontation with the police that resulted in Mumia being critically wounded and a dead policeman. So the death penalty remains as the ultimate sanction in the US.

I also wanted to mention the use of sexual harrassment, in particular against women comrades. That was most developed at Lexington where not only the issue of isolation, but very intentionally the use of male guards - and yet again male guards are used in women's prisons throughout the US - was enforced. I think in isolation units that are specificall designed to break down the identity of strong women pps, they very

intentionally use male guards; they used cameras that were designed to allow the guards to watch the women in the shower, to afford no privacy in the cells, and then for Susan Rosenberg and Alejandrina Torres to physically abuse them - doing forced rectal and vaginal searches. The state feels particularly threatened when women decide to struggle by ~~all particular means~~ "any means necessary" and bring their strength to the struggle and so they have also a particular part of their plan designed to try to break down those women 'pps.

Q: The US government actually claims that it does not hold any pps at all - although there are currently around 200 pps and pows being held in US prisons. Could you eyplain where the pps and pows come from politically and what the trem pow relates to in the US context ?

A. : In the US the national struggle and political struggle has developed largely in relationship to national movements, and by national movements I mean the fact that in the US there have historically developed oppressed nations. Africans were brought to the US as slaves - there is some fluidity now how African Americans call their own national identity as African Americans. Certainly, the word "Black" was used with capital letters, not with a small "b". New Afrikans also try to give a small sense of a transported African people in the US. It is not true that there is a great melting pot in the US. There basically still is a dominant nation that has large oppressed populations where certain individuals can advance, but the bulk of the nations are kept under colonial or semi-colonial conditions.
Similarily there was a Native American population which was conquered and that was largely eradicated, but it has continued to struggle in this country. Puerto Rico was claimed as part of an expansionist war in 1989 and approximately 40% of the Puerto Rican population has immigrated from the actual country of Puerto Rico to the cities of the US And Mexico - the US as part of what is called its "Western expansion" 150 years ago took the Northern half of Mexico through a war against Mexico and a forced treaty. There are some 20 million Mexican people in the US. So people in those populations haev suffer from denial of basic human rights, basic democratic rights. And in many cases as their struggle has developed for basic access - sometimes for instance, like the Black civil rights movement, starting with a view towards assimilation, but through struggle realizing that that really was not going to be won - those movements have often taken the form of explicit national liberation movements with a demand for self-determination in whatever form that can be. So as people have struggled against injustice and for a view of self-determination and liberation, they have encountered the state and in encountering the state people get arrested and become pps. Now within those movements, there, at times, have developed organizations which explicitly are trying to develop an ability to wage armed struggle. The Black Liberation Army (BLA) was one that largely developed from the Black Panther Party (BPP) when the BPP was repressed by the FBI. Some of the

people in the BPP felt the only way they were going to survive was to form an underground resistance. Similarily within the struggle of Puerto Rico, clandestine organizations have developed on the island and here inside the US. The FALN (Fuerzas Armadas de Liberacion National) has been most clearly developed, and in the last few years the Macheteros who are rooted on the island in Puerto Rico have developed. They have had several people who have been arrested and become pps in the US. People from the American Indian Movement (AIM) are in the prisons as pps. And there are also white North Americans such as ourselves who have tried to build our anti-imperialist resistance movement and have fought in various ways against the state, some as part of an armed clandestine resistance. And then there are other white North Americans* who have been involved in militant, but passive civil disobedience actions against the military who are also in the prisons in the US. Now, we all are obviously pps, but the people from the oppressed nations who are waging armed struggle consider themselves under international law to be captured combatants and are prisoners of a liberation struggle recognized by Protocol 2 of the Geneva Conventions and other international conventions. They claim status as pows.

Q: Do the US courts recognize that status ?

A. .: No, the courts refuse to - although it has been challenged many times, the courts in the US refuse to apply international standards, including Puerto Rico as the clearly most recognized example. The world community and the United Nations recognize it as a US colony, but the US courts refuse to recognize it as a US colony and therfore people who are freedom fighters from that movement are not going to be recognized as anti-colonial freedom fighters. Internationally increasingly they are. This was made most clear when William Morales was captured in Mexico and the US tried to extradite him back to the US as a criminal. Mexico decided that he was a pp in the US, that he was a captured combatant from Puerto Rico, refused to extradite him to the US and released him to Cuba where he was given political asylum.Another blow to that strategy was the liberation of Assata Shakur. Assata, a leading member of the BLA, had been characterized by the FBI and the media as a "blood thirsty cop killer". After her liberation from prison she was granted political asylum in Cuba and has since gained recognition internationally and in the US as a respected spokesperson for the Black liberation struggle.

Q: But do these movements themselves claim you as their political prisoners ?

A .: That varies because again there are different realities that are going on - and this is both the strength and the weakness of the pp/pow movement in the US, but also of the social struggle in the US in general. I think that there is a very implicit embracement of pps in Puerto Rico, for example in the case of Filiberto Ojeda Rios who is

* the Plowshare activists

admittedly one of the leaders of the Macheteros. He recently was put on trial. He had been held for several years on charges in the US which he never went on trial for. He was then brought to Puerto Rico and put on trial for a shoot-out when the FBI captured him in 1985. An FBI SWAT team with bazooka automatic weapons attacked his home and he and his wife were there. He defended his home and his life against the attack and one FBI agent was wounded in that shoot-out. He went on trial in Puerto Rico, admitted that he had shot it out with the FBI and basically defended himself in front of a Puerto Rican jury. The jury acquitted Filiberto of all the charges related to the shoot-out. The verdict clearly was not based on legalities, it was based on the fact that Filiberto did have a right to defend himself. I recently spoke to Filiberto and he said in a very humble way that he cannot walk the streets of San Juan without being stopped on every block and somebody coming up to him - and these are not just people from the independence movement - and saying "you represent our country we support you." I think among white North American movements that has not been historically true, and the link has not been made, especially with people charged with organizing in armed struggle. I think it was a weakness as the struggle developed those links were not there, were not organically developed in earlier years and so it is still been an ongoing process since people's capture to try and forge the links between the various levels of struggle. Because certainly I think , the political goals are very shared, and of course the isolation and conditions of capture can make that very difficult to do.

Q: What kind of outside support do pps and pows receive at this point ?

: The support for pps as it is is defined largely by the conditions and the state of the movements we come from. I would say that overall there is not a whole lot of support, there is not a lot of conciousness. We are having to begin from the premise of just establishing the existence of pps in the US from the point of view of conciusness raising and those efforts are just in the beginning. There are some exceptions - there are some pps who are more well-known than others - probably most progressive people in the US are familiar with the case of Leonard Peltier. He has probably more support and recognition than any other pp in the US, and that is probably true internationally as well. His case has some over arching significance for the Native American movement and for the last 10 years or so it has been both a symbolic struggle and rallying point for the Native American movement.
The Puerto Rican pps and pows have support within the Puerto Rican independence movement and it has begun to become more broad in the last two or three years. Filiberto Ojeda Rios and the comrades that were arrested as a group known as the Puerto Rican

Independence 16 and accused members of the Macheteros who are on trial for the expropriation of the Wells Fargo Truck - $ 7 million - have become cases of extreme importance to the independence movement. In the last year and with the coming of discussions about the status of the island, from the point of view of the independence movement and even some of the pro-colony forces, the question of what will happen with the pps and pows is very much part of the discussion because they have been involved in the struggeling for the status of the island.

Q: But it seems that a lot of black pps and pows have not been recognized by the black community. Does that sort of reflect the political state of the black community at this point, that a lot of Black Panthers are sitting in the jails and have been there for many yeras and seem to be forgotten, or is that a wrong impression ?

: I don´t think it is a wrong impression. But what has to be understood is that one of the outcomes of the counterintelligence program that was developed in the 60s and early 70s was, that the organizational structure in the Black community was really targetted for destruction and was somewhat succesfully destroyed. Not just revolutionary organizations - you can go back and read FBI papers - groups like "Black Architects" had formed and were infiltrated. Any kind of organization that led people´s struggle on their own terms was systematically targetted for destruction. And if you don´t have forms of organizations you just cannot reach a mass of people and you cannot even perpetuate your own history very easily. And then, let´s face it - the other thing is that some of the people who were militants were coopted. A small percentage, you know, that was part of the programme too. You set up university programmes, you get people middle class, some of the perks that come with social advamcements . You can destroy a movement partially through repression and also partially through cooperation. Even under Reagan you have to look at the fact that Ronald Reagan never met with any of the leaders of the major, very mainstream reformist black civil rights organizations. It was very clear that the US government was not going to allow black people any self-directed organization through which they could struggle.I think that there will be a more active claiming of the people who have struggled in that direction and there is a base of support. I just think that there is much more of a base of support that is incipient there, that could be mobilized , but it is not organized, it is not directed at this point, and therefore it cannot make itself felt.

Q: In the FRG support work for pps is really viewed as an important front in the fight against repression and people who are doing that kind of work often define themselves as anti-imperialists. Is there any comparison to the support that you receive as white North American anti-imperialist prisoners ?

[illegible]: No, I don't think there is any comparison. It is just at an altogether different starting point. Here in the US, " anti-imperialism" is defined somewhat differently than in the FRG. Here it refers to those sectors of the progressive movement which analyze the US as an imperialist nation, oppose imperialism as a whole system and act in solidarity with national liberation movements. The anti-imperialist movement here is very small and very isolated. I would say within having spoken some about the other national liberation struggles, within the dominant white left there is a very low level of conciusness of pps and pows, wether it is the pps from any of the national liberation movements or the anti-imperialist left. So, one they don't really know that we exist. Those that do know, and the support that we began to get through our trials in the last couple of years, is fairly defined at the level of basic humanitarian, human rights concerns. It is just not seen yet as a significant front of the struggle in and of itself. Perhaps that was more true in the 70s when some of the urban rebellions were taking place. When George Jackson whose name might be familiar to people in the FRG was assassinated in a California prison and there were a series of uprisings around the country. There were numerous pps in prison from the struggles of the 60s and they played a role in those rebellions, and there was a much different sense about the prisons as a whole, but some of the pps as well. At this point there is really no perspective of the pps as being like the fighters or combatants of a movement and that you take steps to defend those people as part of defending your own movement.

[illegible]: I think that is something that is changing. Until very recently there were not many people who were even doing it for humanitarian reasons. In fact what we had there was a very small core of people who were themselves committed anti-imperialists who were doing it clearly, I think, for basic political purposes in terms of seeing both the prisoners as very important people for the movement - having supported the development of the clandestine organizations themselves - and seeing it as a form of being able to expose and fight the repressive part of the state and what the FBI was doing and believing that it was important to strengthen the movement. Even a lot of people who are involved in social movemnents in the US don't understand that the state respondsby repression if challenged. We have had a difficult time even perpetuating our own history and it is actively being rewritten all the time. People don't remember what really happened in the 60s, even in terms of the role of the FBI and various red squads. So that when CISPES (Committee in Solidarity with the Peoples of El Salvador) which is a Central America anti-intervention movement was targetted by the FBI and that operation was finally exposed in the 80s , people thought it was a new thing. No, it wasn't a new thing at all, it goes back - it was the perpetuation of something that as the social struggle had gone down was less obvious. And then as people began to respond and tried to challenge US policies in Central America, the FBI resumed its role much more aggressive

as a political police force. And so I think it is in fact only in the last few years that around the core of committed anti-imperialists who have done that work there now are others supporting pps.

Q: Do you think that the broad opposition against the HSU in Lexington was sort of a starting point for the recognition of pps by a broader public ?

S : Yes, definitely it backfired on the US government. The US government or the Bureau of Prisons never thought that there would be the kind of opposition that ended up emerging in relationship to Lexington. They thought that the rethoric of terrorism would be enough to scare off any kind of human rights activity and they miscalculated on that basis.Also it was such an extreme and so obviously an experiment that I think contributed to that. And I would say that specifically the Puerto Rican independence movement had a very important role to play at least in initiating that opposition.

Q: And do you think the public awareness that was created through that can continue, for xeample during the time of your trial or do you feel that the campaign against the LExington HSU was yet another one of the single issue mobilizations in the US ?

S : I think it was mixed. SupportIng people, supporting human rights which is something a lot of people can get behind - although not enough - is coming. The dominant basis upon which people objected to Lexington was that they didn't like isolation, ~~which is on~~ - and it's easier to become involved in opposing that than it is to support revolutionaries. ~~thing to support.~~ ~~They~~ people didn't like a democratic country torturing its own dissidents, which really was what was going on there. That is a little bit different than when you are going on trial as being an enemy of the state in a very self-concious , politically orchestrated show trial where the government has a lot at stake in winning a victory right there and then. But.I think in so far as a climate was created through not just LExington, but through the attack on the Puerto Rican movement, through the attack that went on against the Black movements - in New York the number of political attacks has resulted in trials and then the emergence of more pps - the emergence of both has come together in beginning to change at least minimally, but I think significantly, a climate that says " yes, there is political opposition, there is repression, it is political, there is a political police, and yes, there are pps". So, I think there has been a number of things, including the Lexington struggle, that went on that have created a climate that hopefully will help us as the struggle intensifies which undoubtedly it will.

I : One of the sources that our support has come from in the last period is from the gay and lesbian movement. And I think that part of that is because Linda and I have been out-lesbians, have said that we are lesbians and that four of us in this case are women, that all of us have fought for women's liberation, including the man who

have supported the struggle for women's liberation very much in their political histories too. But I think that there is another reason , which is that the gay and lesbian movement is challenging the government on the question of AIDS which is a life and death struggle for people. It brings people up against control of the state over their lives and their bodies and how they live their lives. The growth of homophobia in this period, the increase of the attacks on gay people, and the increase in laws directed against gay people is having an impact on people's thinking. So ACT UP, which is the most militant part of the AIDS movement, has been extremely militant in its actions. And I think that when you are in a confrontation with the state like that you have less questions about other people who resist. You are more interested in uniting with people against a common enemy, which is a concept that is very important to us.

Q: Where do you see the role of pps in the slow re-emergence of a more grassroots level of opposition within the different national communities. And where do you see your own role ? How do you think that it will be possible to achieve some unity and to relate to the struggles on the outside ?

S : I think that prisons in the US are going to become an increasing focus of resistance in the US, both at the human rights level and at the level of violence and resistance and rebellion inside the prisons. The prisons are going to play - and have historically played an important role for the state in syphoning off the most radical, militant elements of not even necessarily the self-concious opposition, but people who are in rebellion against their conditions, either as a result of racism or poverty.
The state itself says that in the US in less than 5 yeras from now, 1 million people will be in prison which is an enormous percentage of the population. I think the role of pps will be greater if we are accepted as such by the movements and the social opposition and the political opposition that develops. Certainly we have to play a role in the prisons itself in trying to build unity among as many prisoners - social and political prisoners - in order to forge a front of struggle inside the prisons to make that rebellion something more direct. And I think that is one of the reasons why the government clearly wants to isolate us. Beyond that specifically as pps we have a responsibility to keep a flame of resistance alive in the sense of an ideological, political position. We represent something that has historically been important in the left. Right now the dominant location of us is in prison which is a big problem. I think probably similar to some earlier periods in the FRG when a number of people where in the prisons and a voice that needed to be on the outside was not there. And how well we can or we can not do that is going to be determined by a number of things - the use of isolation in the US, the use of control units, and the struggle that ahs brought about recognition of ensuring of our defense on human rights. I think we are all going to push the struggle ourselves

Q: Let me ask you a question in relation to that. In the FRG , the prisoners of the RAF and the resistance have been for years fighting isolation with the demand for association of all pps . This demand has also the central demand of the last hunger-strike and it is the central demand for most of the support work on the outside. Do you see pps in the US, do you see yourselves at a point where you will demand association ?

. . : I think in the longer term it will be a demand. Given the real material conditions in this country around the question of pps, I don´t think it is a demand that we can yet establish. I think we are still at the stage of in a sense combating the US government´s criminalization of pps. We will be somewhat succesful but I think it is a long struggle. It is like trying to look at things in stages - and one stage of it is to really affirm that there are pps in the US.

... .: I know it is a big question to people in Europe who ask " why don´t you demand association, or why isn´t ther unity". But again we are talking about a situation where there are prisoners from every different struggle.So while we have a very strong basis - we are in the prisons together - to build unity against the state, and where we have been together we have done that absolutely - we also are responsible to and accountable in some ways to different movements on the outside. And you as a prisoner do not implement your own strategy separate from whatever goals and definitions and struggles are of the movement that you are part of.
One specific example in terms of an answer to that is that the Puerto Rican pows - there are 25 in the US prisons - have raised the demand for association at different points to all be put in a military prison and to be tried in a military court under basically what are the Geneva Accords that would be applied to pows. And that flows from a political position of their movement that they are colonized people and therefore have a right to tha under international law. They don´t raise this demand all the time, but they raised it at different points.Of course their is no response by the US government , but there is a response in keeping them separated from one prison to another. The men are all in different prisons around the country, and there are 50 federal prisons in the US in a lot of differen places. I think that is one part of an answer to the issue of how do we raise association. In the last 5 years 22 anti-imperialists have entered the prisons as pps. And I think we have to make a determination about what and how we want to deal with that issue and I think as Marilyn said it is a process. My personal feeling is that we did have small group isolation at Lexington, but it functioned as association. And it was the reason why we could maintain and win the struggle in Lexington. Personally, I think that we will demand association, but how we do it, when we do it, on what basis and for whom are all questions that we have to struggle out as the state implements its strategy and as we understand the conditions we are in. One reason why I do feel that we will end up raising

that demand and not general population is because I strongly believe that as a pp you have to have a political struggle with the state. It is not automatic, there is nothing automatic about maintaining your political stand when you spend years in behaviour modification, isolation, regimentation. So then the issue of an active confrontation with the state , which I think is our role inside the prisons, means that there has to be something very specific. But because of the empire, because of the colonialism, because there are different prisoners from different nations, struggles, classes, sexes, movements we have to figure that out. And I think the government is going to do everything it can to make the dialogue around that impossible. I really think the first struggle we are going to have is about even being able to have some kind of communication.
The conditions for the struggle for association are very , very different from Europe, both in the content of prison life itself, but also in terms of what exists on the outside that can help tp push for and organize for that demand.

Q: In the relatives info during the hungerstrike of the prisoners of the RAF and the resistance, there were a number of letters from you and there were also reports on support activities around the hs in the FRG. What kind of role did you play in that and how do you relate to the overall struggle of the prisoners from the RAF and the resistance ?

[illegible]: We have had a relationship of shared struggle for the last ten years, and increasingly in the last 5 or six years. We have tried to study the movement in the FRG which is at an altogether higher level of development than us here. We have also studied the organiza- armed organizations in the FRG, because it is justa very difficult thing to establish a guerilla front and for better or worse, with its ups and downs, the RAF has existed for close to 20 years in the FRG and that is a significant achievement. So, naturally we are trying to study that from a point of view of political revolutionary resistance. When we came into the prisons this interest really just continued to grow, largely because many of us were immediately confronted with isolation. And then all of us received immediate gestures of solidarity from the pps in the FRG and it just reaffirmed a bond which we felt at a more abstract level for a period of time. They and their attorneys invited our attorneys to come to the FRG and there has been a constant exchange since 1984 about understanding the means of repression and the means of fighting that. And we have benefitted tremendously from our relationship with the pps in the FRG, both in terms of concrete suggestions and ideas about how to combat isolation on an individual level, and also more recently, we have been learning a lot from them about the importance of and the integrity of the movement and struggle for the pps within the anti-imperialist movement as a whole.
So, I just want to preface the issue of the hs with saying that there had been a pre-existing and very solid relationship. So, when we heard about the hs being called, to us it

wasn´t just an occasion to send a nice solidarity message. We felt that the most importan thing that we could do would be to try and break through the media blockade that existed around the hs, and we thought that we could try and mobilize some support activity of pol tical prisoners in the US. As it happened , at the same time there was also a significant hs going on in South Africa of political detainees who were on strike against preventive detention which is also an issue here, it is also an issue for us in this case. The struggle against apartheid and US support for apartheid in solidarity with the Southern African national liberation movements has been extremely formative to our experience. We couldn´t do one and not do the other. There was just sort of a coalescence of issues and events that demanded a response and we sent out a call for solidarity to the other pps - I don´t think, that such a thing has quite ever been done on that level and we didn´t know what to expect. We called for a one day solidarity fast, and on the day that it ha it turned out that close to 600 prisoners participated from around the country.

Q: Both social and political prisoners ?

: I would say the majority was social prisoners. I think dominantly the social prisoners were responding to South Africa and we understood, that that would be the case initially, but because there were also comrades, Puerto Rican pows, and some other anti-imperialist prisoners who were organizing and leading the efforts there, we know that they did a lot of educational work about the FRG and about the RAF prisoners and about isolation. And so while South Africa may have been the starting point for amny prisoners in the end of it, people knew who the RAF was and what the hs was about.

Q: Do you feel that this was also a starting point to raise the level of conciousness and activities inside US prisons ?

: Absolutely, that was so important about it. It did initiate a number of actions of self-determined activity by prisoners themselves, especially prisoners on death row. So the important part was prisoners acting together and I don´t think it ever quite happened this way, at least not since the early 70s , but certainly not around issues of international solidarity.

Q: And it seems to have related to activities on the streets as well. We saw some pictures of a demonstration in New York City .

: There were small demonstrations. There was a confrontation at the FRG consulate in NYC where people demanded to see the West-German ambassador and got to see one of the press flakes who insisted that he had no knowledge of any hs in the FRG. But we made some break-throughs in the media, some in the left press, but mostly in the international press.